

REMARKS

I. The Rejection of Claims 1-15 and 37-40

Claims 1-15 and 37-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Percy et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,960,429 (“Percy”) in view of Doyle, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0099807 (“Doyle”). Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Each of claims 1-15 and 37-40 includes the feature of selecting “an entry from a set of replaceable entries in [a] table, where the table includes both replaceable and irreplaceable entries”, among other features. In the Office Action, the Examiner implicitly if not explicitly, admits that the combination of Percy and Doyle does not disclose or suggest such a selection. To overcome this deficiency the Examiner relies on Official Notice and cites U.S. Patent No. 6,826,652 to Chauvel et al. (“Chauvel”) as an example of a reference that includes both replaceable and irreplaceable entries. While Chauvel appears to disclose some type of irreplaceable entry (e.g., Chauvel’s “locked entries”) the excerpt cited by the Examiner does not discuss replaceable entries. As important, Applicants note that Chauvel explicitly states that a cache system that uses such locked entries is undesirable because it further reduces the efficiency of a cache. Said another way, Chauvel explicitly teaches away from using irreplaceable and/or replaceable entries to operate a cache.

In contrast, claims 1-15 and 37-40 are directed at a novel method of using replaceable and irreplaceable entries to operate a cache.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Doyle, Percy and Chauvel does not disclose or suggest “counting the number of times an Internet site name has been received, and if the Internet site name is new and the table is full, selecting an entry from a set of

replaceable entries in a table, where the a table includes both replaceable and irreplaceable entries,” as in claims 1-15 and 37-40. One of ordinary skill in the art upon reading the disclosures of Doyle, Peercy and Chauvel would conclude that some other technique other than using replaceable and irreplaceable entries must be used to operate a cache in order to operate the cache more efficiently; this is inapposite to the claims of the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-15 and 37-40.

II. The Rejection of Claims 16-20, 22-31, 33-36 and 41

Claims 16-20, 22-31, 33-36 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peercy, in view of Doyle and in further view of Swildens, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0034772 (“Swildens”).

Preliminarily, Applicant submits that Swildens does nothing to make up for the deficiencies of Peercy and Doyle discussed above. That is, Swildens does not disclose a table which includes both replaceable and irreplaceable entries as is required by Applicant’s claims.

In addition, the Examiner acknowledges that neither Peercy nor Doyle discloses or suggests the conversion of an “Internet site name into a hash number and storing the number into an entry in a table” as in claims 16-20, 22-31, 33-36 and 41. The Examiner relies on Swildens to make up for this deficiency.

Applicant has read the portion of Swildens referred to, and relied upon, by the Examiner in the Office Action. This portion has nothing at all to do with the conversion of an Internet site name into a hash number in order to identify frequently used Internet site names. Instead, it appears to relate to the forwarding of packets.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 16-20, 22-31, 33-36, and 41 are not rendered obvious by the combination of Percy, Doyle and Swildens. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of these claims.

III. The Rejection of Claims 38, 40 and 42

The Examiner appears to reject these claims based on a combination of Percy and Doyle, citing Percy, column 2, lines 19-25. Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Applicant notes that these claims depend on claims 1 and 16 and are allowable over Percy combined with Doyle for the reasons set forth above.

In addition, each of these claims includes the feature of an audio file, cached resource. Contrary to the position taken by the Examiner, the excerpt in Percy does not disclose or suggest such an audio file. Rather, this excerpt at most discloses the transmission of an HTML page from a web server to a browser for display to a user. There is no mention or suggestion of a cached audio file.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of claims 38, 40 and 42.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John E. Curtin at the telephone number of the undersigned below.


In the event this Response does not place the present application in condition for allowance, applicant requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned at (703) 668-8000 to schedule a personal interview.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



John E. Curtin, Reg. No. 37,602
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

JEC:ame